



# **California State Board of Education January 2019 Agenda Item #21**

## **Subject**

State Annual Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 covering program year 2017–18.

## **Type of Action**

Action, Information

## **Summary of the Issue(s)**

As required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, Part B, the California Department of Education (CDE), Special Education Division (SED), developed the State Performance Plan (SPP), a six-year plan covering federal fiscal year (FFY) 2013–14 through 2018–19, using the instructions determined by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The SED prepares an Annual Performance Report (APR), an update under the SPP, each year that covers California's progress on 5 compliance indicators, 11 performance indicators, and 1 indicator with both compliance and performance components. The attached report is for program year 2017–18.

This report provides data on the status of California's students with disabilities in 17 required federal indicators as required for submission annually under the IDEA. A number of these indicators overlap with California's Dashboard, the state's accountability system. The established federal targets for these overlapping indicators (graduation rate, suspension/expulsion, and assessment) predate California's new accountability system, and thus the calculation methodology and targets for these indicators differ, and are calculated based on specific parameters set by the OSEP. As the lead state educational agency for California, the State Board of Education (SBE) must approve this report and these data prior to submission. Failure to submit this report to OSEP may result in the withholding of federal IDEA funds.

The SED has reviewed protocols and approaches for compliance monitoring selection and support under IDEA to maximize alignment to the greatest extent possible with the statewide system of support. During the March 2018 SBE meeting, the board approved Phase III of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) which aligned SED monitoring activities with the California Dashboard and the California Statewide System of Support. The system of support brings new opportunities for improving student outcomes by utilizing the Dashboard, which includes accountability data for students with disabilities. The work necessary for this alignment will continue over the course of the coming year.

Over the last year SED has worked to include activities that support LEAs in improving outcomes for students with disabilities and to better align with the system of support. SED has also increased the number of technical assistance contracts that target specific areas of need in special education, such as least restrictive environment. This “all boats rise” approach will move special education off of the sidelines and into the conversations about how to support the totality of an LEA, eliminating the practice of developing separate plans and processes for different student groups, and reinforcing the one system approach to serving all students.

## **Recommendation**

The CDE recommends the SBE review and approve the Executive Summary of the FFY 2017 APR for Part B of the IDEA covering program year 2017–18 as prepared by the SED.

## **Brief History of Key Issues**

The APR is presented to the SBE annually for review and approval as part of the CDE's annual report to the public on the performance of its local educational agencies (LEAs) in serving students with disabilities. The APR documents describe the progress of LEAs and the state toward meeting targets and benchmarks identified in the SPP, and summarizes the statewide selection for monitoring activities associated with each of the target indicators in the SPP. A stakeholder workgroup assisted the SED in establishing and re-benching performance indicators during meetings held from December 2014 through June 2015. The targets are included in the Executive Summary.

Similar to last year, this item contains SPP/APR indicators 1 through 16 that document overall progress as measured by state data. Indicator 17 describes improvement activities of the state in the SSIP, which will be prepared for the March 2019 SBE meeting.

On February 1, 2019, upon approval of this item by the SBE, the SPP and APR for indicators 1 through 16 will be submitted to the OSEP. Indicator 17 will be presented to the SBE at its March 2019 meeting and will be submitted, upon approval, to the OSEP on April 1, 2019.

## **Summary of Previous State Board of Education Discussion and Action**

In January 2018, the SBE approved the FFY 2016 APR Executive Summary which reported on the progress of the 2016–17 compliance and performance indicators as required by the IDEA.

## **Fiscal Analysis (as appropriate)**

Absent approval, California's approximately \$1.2 Billion Federal IDEA funding could be jeopardized.

## **Attachment(s)**

Attachment 1: Executive Summary of the FFY 2017 State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act covering program year 2017–18 (40 pages).

# **Attachment 1**

California Department of Education

Special Education Division

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004

State Annual Performance Report

Executive Summary

Federal Fiscal Year 2017 (Program Year 2017–18)

January 2019

## Table of Contents

Attachment 1.....	1
Special Education in California.....	6
Accountability and Data Collection.....	6
Table 1: California State Indicators.....	7
Overview of Population and Services.....	8
Table 2: Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Disability Type.....	8
Table 3: Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Type of School.....	9
Table 4: Services Provided to Students with Disabilities.....	9
2017–18 Annual Performance Report Indicators.....	9
Table 5: Federal Fiscal Year 2017 Indicators, Target, Results, and Change.....	10
Indicator 1: Graduation Rate.....	12
Description.....	12
Target for 2017–18.....	12
Measurement.....	12
Results for 2017–18.....	12
Target Met: No.....	12
Indicator 2: Dropout Rate.....	13
Description.....	13
Target for 2017–18.....	13
Measurement.....	13
Results for 2017–18.....	13
Target Met: Yes.....	13
Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment.....	14
Description.....	14
Targets for 2017–18.....	14
Measurement.....	14
Results for 2017–18.....	15
Target Met: 3A Not Reported 3B No 3C Yes/No.....	15
Indicator 4A: Suspension and Expulsion Overall.....	16
Description.....	16
Target for 2017–18.....	16

Measurement.....	16
Results for 2017–18.....	16
Target Met: Yes.....	16
Indicator 4B: Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race or Ethnicity.....	17
Description.....	17
Target for 2017–18.....	17
Measurement.....	17
Results for 2017–18.....	17
Target Met:.....	17
Indicator 5: Education Environments.....	18
Description.....	18
Targets for 2017–18.....	18
Measurement.....	18
Results for 2017–18.....	18
Target Met: 5A Yes 5B Yes 5C Yes.....	19
Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environments.....	20
Description.....	20
Target for 2017–18.....	20
Measurement.....	20
Results for 2017–18.....	20
Target Met: 6A Yes 6B No.....	20
Indicator 7A: Preschool Assessment–Positive Social-Emotional Skills.....	22
Description.....	22
Targets for 2017–18.....	22
Measurement.....	22
Results for 2017–18.....	22
Target Met: No.....	23
Indicator 7B: Preschool Assessment–Acquisition/Use of Knowledge and Skills.....	24
Description.....	24
Targets for 2017–18.....	24
Measurement.....	24
Results for 2017–18.....	25

Target Met: No.....	25
Indicator 7C: Preschool Assessment–Use of Appropriate Behaviors.....	26
Description.....	26
Targets for 2017–18.....	26
Measurement.....	26
Results for 2017–18.....	26
Target Met: Yes/No.....	27
Indicator 8: Percent of Parents Reporting the Schools Facilitated Parental Involvement.....	28
Description.....	28
Target for 2017–18.....	28
Measurement.....	28
Results for 2017–18.....	28
Target Met: Yes.....	28
Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation.....	29
Description.....	29
Target for 2017–18.....	29
Measurement.....	29
Results for 2017–18.....	29
Target Met:.....	29
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation by Disability Categories.....	30
Description.....	30
Target for 2017–18.....	30
Measurement.....	30
Results for 2017–18.....	30
Target Met:.....	30
Indicator 11: Child Find.....	31
Description.....	31
Target for 2017–18.....	31
Measurement.....	31
Results for 2017–18.....	31
Target Met: No.....	31
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition.....	32

Description.....	32
Target for 2017–18.....	32
Measurement.....	32
Results for 2017–18.....	32
Target Met: No.....	32
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition.....	34
Description.....	34
Target for 2017–18.....	34
Measurement.....	34
Results for 2017–18.....	34
Target Met: No.....	34
Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes.....	36
Description.....	36
Target for 2017–18.....	36
Measurement.....	36
Results for 2017–18.....	37
Target Met: A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes.....	37
Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions.....	38
Description.....	38
Target for 2017–18.....	38
Measurement.....	38
Results for 2017–18.....	38
Target Met: No.....	38
Indicator 16: Mediation.....	39
Description.....	39
Target for 2017–18.....	39
Measurement.....	39
Results for 2017–18.....	39
Target Met: No.....	39
Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).....	40

## **Special Education in California**

The California Department of Education (CDE) provides state leadership and policy guidance to local educational agencies (LEAs) for special education programs and services for students with disabilities, birth to twenty-two years. Special education is defined as specially designed instruction and services, at no cost to parents, to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. Special education services are available in a variety of settings, including daycare, preschool, regular classrooms, classrooms that emphasize specially designed instruction, the community, and the work environment.

The CDE also provides families with information on the education of students with disabilities and works cooperatively with other state agencies to provide a range of services from family-centered services for infant and preschool children with disabilities to planned steps for transition from high school to employment and quality adult life. The CDE responds to consumer complaints and administers programs related to the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA) and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) for students with disabilities in California.

## **Accountability and Data Collection**

In accordance with the IDEA, California is required to report annually to the U.S. Department of Education (ED) on California's performance and progress meeting targets defined in the State Performance Plan (SPP). This report is the State's Annual Performance Report (APR). The APR requires the CDE to report on 17 indicators (table 1) that examines a comprehensive array of compliance and performance requirements relating to the provision of special education and related services. The California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS) and the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) are the data reporting and retrieval systems used by the CDE for students with disabilities. CASEMIS provides LEAs a statewide standard for maintaining a core of special education data at the local level that is used for accountability reporting and to meet statutory and programmatic needs in special education.

The CDE is required to publish the APR for public review. The current APR reflects data collected during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017, which is equivalent to California's school year 2017–18. Indicators 1, 2, and 4 are reported in lag years using data from school year 2016–17. The 17 federal indicators include 11 performance indicators, 5 compliance indicators, and 1 indicator with both performance and compliance components (Indicator 4). All compliance indicator targets are set by the ED at either 0 or 100 percent. Performance indicator targets were established based on recommendations of a stakeholder group, and approved by the State Board of Education (SBE) in November 2014 (Table 5).

**Table 1: California State Indicators**

Indicator Type	No.	Description
Performance	1	Graduation Rates
Performance	2	Dropout Rates
Performance	3	Statewide Assessments
Performance	3A	LEAs Meeting Accountability for Students with Disabilities
Performance	3B	Participation for Students with Disabilities
Performance	3C	Proficiency for Students with Disabilities
Combined	4	Suspension and Expulsion
Performance	4A	Rates of Suspension and Expulsion
Compliance	4B	Rates of Suspension and Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity
Performance	5	Education Environments
Performance	5A	Education Environments (In Regular Class $\geq$ 80% of day)
Performance	5B	Education Environments (In Regular Class $<$ 40% of day)
Performance	5C	Education Environments (Served in separate school or other placement)
Performance	6	Preschool Environments
Performance	6A	Preschool Environments: Services in the regular childhood program
Performance	6B	Preschool Environments: Separate special education class, school, or facility
Performance	7	Preschool Outcomes
Performance	7A	Preschool Outcomes: Positive social-emotional skills
Performance	7B	Preschool Outcomes: Acquisition/use of knowledge and skills
Performance	7C	Preschool Outcomes: Use of Appropriate Behaviors
Performance	8	Parent Involvement
Compliance	9	Disproportionate Representation
Compliance	10	Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories
Compliance	11	Child Find
Compliance	12	Early Childhood Transition
Compliance	13	Secondary Transition
Performance	14	Post-school Outcomes
Performance	14A	Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school
Performance	14B	Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school
Performance	14C	Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school
Performance	15	Resolution Sessions
Performance	16	Mediation
Performance	17	State Systemic Improvement Plan

## Overview of Population and Services

During FFY 2017–18, a total of 774,665 students from birth to twenty-two years received special education from LEAs. There are 6,220,413 kindergarten through twelfth grade students enrolled in California, students with disabilities comprise 11.2 percent of that population. Almost half of students with disabilities in California (49 percent) are between six and twelve years of age; over two-thirds of students with disabilities are male (68 percent); and over a quarter are English-language learners (28 percent). Of all students with disabilities, Hispanic/Latino students represent the greatest numbers of students in need of special education and related services (56 percent) followed by White students (25 percent). All tables and figures are based on students with disabilities birth to twenty-two years.

California students identified as having at least one disability are eligible for individualized services to meet their unique needs. There are 14 disability categories, as displayed in Table 2. The most common primary disability category designation for students is Specific Learning Disability (38.4 percent), followed by Speech or Language Impairment (20.4 percent).

**Table 2: Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Disability Type**

<b>Disability</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Specific Learning Disability (SLD)	297,468	38.4
Speech or Language Impairment (SLI)	161,485	20.8
Autism (AUT)	112,318	14.5
Other Health Impairment (OHI)	97,426	12.6
Intellectual Disability (ID)	43,855	5.7
Emotional Disturbance (ED)	24,936	3.2
Orthopedic Impairment (OI)	10,453	1.3
Hard of Hearing (HH)	10,633	1.3
Multiple Disability (MD)	7,161	0.9
Visual Impairment (VI)	3,487	0.4
Deafness (DEAF)	3,242	0.4
Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI)	1,618	0.2
Established Medical Disability (EMD)	468	0.06
Deaf Blindness (DB)	115	0.01
Totals	774,665	100.0

CASEMIS, Dec 2017

The CDE also tracks the type of school or program in which students with disabilities receive the majority of their instructional services. These include public schools, private schools, independent study, charter schools, community schools, correctional programs, higher education, and transition programs. Table 3 shows the top three school types for students with disabilities with the greatest proportion of students enrolled in a public day school (85.02 percent).

**Table 3: Enrollment of Students with Disabilities by Type of School**

<b>School Type</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Public Day School	658,646	85.02
Charter School	56,433	7.28
All Other School Types	59,586	7.70
Totals	774,665	100.0

CASEMIS, Dec 2017

Students with disabilities in California receive a variety of services to address their unique needs. During FFY 2017–18, there were 1,864,875 services provided to California's students with disabilities, many receiving multiple services. Table 4 lists the most commonly provided services to students. The most common service provided was Specialized Academic Instruction (34.06 percent) followed by Language and Speech (20.39 percent).

**Table 4: Services Provided to Students with Disabilities**

<b>Services</b>	<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Specialized Academic Instruction	635,219	34.06
Language and Speech	380,265	20.39
Vocational/Career	186,919	10.02
Mental Health Services	150,852	8.07
All Other Services	511,620	27.46
Total	1,864,875	100.0

CASEMIS, Dec 2017

## 2017–18 Annual Performance Report Indicators

During FFY 2017, California met 38 percent of the 16 target indicators. Table 5 identifies each indicator, its target, the FFY 2017 state results, and whether or not the target was met. The pages following Table 5 provide an overview of each individual indicator, including a description of the indicator, the target, the data collected, the results, and whether there was an increase or decrease in the results from prior year.

**Table 5: Federal Fiscal Year 2017 Indicators, Target, Results, and Change**

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>Met Target</b>	<b>Change from Prior Year</b>
1 Graduation	90%	65.0%	No	-0.5%
2 Drop Out	≤11.72%	11.36%	Yes	-2.39%
3 Statewide Assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3B Participation	95% ELA/Math	94.2%/93.8%	No	Various

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>Met Target</b>	<b>Change from Prior Year</b>
3C Elementary, High, and Unified Districts	14.9% ELA, 12.6% Math	Various	Yes/No	Various
4 Suspension/Expulsion	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4A Suspension and Expulsion Rate Overall	≤10%	3.67%	Yes	+0.46%
4B Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race/Ethnicity	0%	6.34%	No	+3.56%
5 Education Environments	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5A Regular Class 80 percent or more	≥51.2%	56.10%	Yes	+1.2%
5B Regular Class less than 40 percent	≤22.6%	19.82%	Yes	-0.8%
5C Separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	≤4.0%	3.40%	Yes	-0.10%
6 Preschool Least Restrictive Environments	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6A Regular Preschool	>34.9%	37.31%	Yes	-7.88%
6B Separate Schools or classes	<32.4%	33.80%	No	+3.94%
7 Preschool Assessment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7A Positive Social-Emotional Skills	83.2%/79.5%	76.7%/77.6%	No	-5.5%/-0.9%
7B Use of Knowledge and Skills	80.7%/78.57%	76.1%/76.7%	No	-3.6%/0.9%
7C Use of Appropriate Behaviors	74.70%/77.45%	75.3%/77.0%	Yes/No	+1.6%/0.5%
8 Parent Involvement	92.0%	99.56%	Yes	+0.06%
9 Disproportionate Representation	0%	0.88%	No	-1.69%
10 Disproportional Representation by Disability Category	0%	27.76%	No	+10.62%
11 Child Find	100%	97.86%	No	-0.7%
12 Early Childhood Transition	100%	95.20%	No	+1.2%

<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>Met Target</b>	<b>Change from Prior Year</b>
13 Secondary Transition	100%	99.77%	No	No Change
14 Post-School Outcomes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14A Enrolled in Higher Education	53.30%	54.0%	Yes	+5.1%
14B Enrolled in Higher Education or Competitively Employed within a Year	73.4%	77.6%	Yes	+5.0%
14C Enrolled in Higher Education, Postsecondary Education or Training or Competitively Employed	82.0%	85.6%	Yes	+3.9%
15 Resolution Sessions	59%	24.1%	No	-7.14%
16 Mediation	59%	57.8%	No	+4.2%
17 State Systemic Improvement Plan	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## Indicator 1: Graduation Rate

### Description

Indicator 1 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of youth with individualized education programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular diploma (20 *United States Code [U.S.C.]* 1416 [a][3][A]). The calculation methods for this indicator were revised in 2008–09 and again in 2009–10, to align with reporting criteria under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). A new reporting methodology was implemented for the FFY 2012 APR. The graduation rate uses the four year adjusted cohort. The four-year adjusted cohort is the number of students who graduate from high school in four years with a regular high school diploma, divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for the graduating class. As the new accountability standards for the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) are implemented, this data will change in future years.

### Target for 2017–18

A 2017 graduation rate of 90 percent or more. This target represent changes approved by the SBE and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFYs 2013–18.

### Measurement

Data are reported in lag years using the CALPADS data from FFY 2016 (2016–17). The graduation rate is calculated by the number of students with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma divided by number of students with IEPs eligible to graduate.

### Results for 2017–18

The graduation rate for FFY 2017 demonstrated 65 percent of students with disabilities graduated with a high school diploma.

### Target Met: No

#### Graduation Rate Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 1	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%	90%
Result	61.8	62.2%	64.5%	65.5%	65.0%	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	No	N/A	N/A

## Indicator 2: Dropout Rate

### Description

Indicator 2 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities dropping out of high school (20 U.S.C. 1416 [a][3][A]). The calculation methodology for this indicator was revised in 2009–10 to create a more rigorous target and approved by the OSEP in April 2010. Dropout rates are calculated from data reported for grades nine through twelve. The CDE uses an annual (one-year) dropout rate. The rate estimates the percent of students who would drop out in a four-year period based on data collected for a single year.

### Target for 2017–18

No more than 11.72 percent of students with disabilities will drop out of high school. These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFYs 2013–18.

### Measurement

The data are reported in lag years using CASEMIS data from FFY 2016 (2016–17). The CDE uses an annual (one-year) dropout rate.

### Results for 2017–18

For FFY 2017, the Dropout Rate was 11.36 percent.

**Target Met: Yes**

### Drop Out Rate Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 2	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	15.72%	14.72%	13.72%	12.72%	11.72%	10.72%
Result	15.7%	17.5%	14.46%	13.75%	11.36%	N/A
Target Met	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	N/A

### **Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment**

#### **Description**

Indicator 3 is a performance indicator that measures the participation and performance of students with disabilities on statewide assessments including: participation rate for students with disabilities; and rate of students with disabilities meeting standards against grade-level, modified, and alternate academic achievement standards (20 U.S.C. 1416 [a][3][A]).

#### **Targets for 2017–18**

Targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFYs 2013–18.

- 3A. This indicator is not currently reported per direction from the ED. This indicator is no longer used as it was a calculated percentage tied to Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) which no longer exists.
- 3B. The annual benchmark and target for participation on statewide assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and math is 95 percent (rounded to nearest whole number), as established under ESEA.
- 3C. Consistent with the ESEA accountability framework, the 2016–17 annual benchmarks for the percent of students with disabilities proficient on statewide assessments are broken down by subject and student group. The targets for each student group is listed below.

ELA = 14.9 percent

Math = 12.6 percent

#### **Measurement**

Participation rate percentage equals the number of students with disabilities participating in the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress tests divided by the total number of students with disabilities enrolled on the first day of testing, calculated separately for reading and math.

Proficiency rate percentage equals the number of students with disabilities scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards divided by the total number of students with disabilities who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned. Calculated separately for reading and math.

**Results for 2017–18****Target Met:**

3A Not Reported

3B No

3C Yes/No

**A. In FFY 2017 for Target A, the results are as follows:**

Percent of LEAs Meeting AYP for disability student group (3A)

Indicator 3A	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	58%	59%	60%	61%	62%	63%
Result	17%	78.5%	*	*	*	*
Target Met	No	Yes	*	*	*	*

\* This indicator is not currently reported per direction from the U.S Department of Education.

**B. In FFY 2017 for Target B, the results are as follows:**

Percent of Participation for Students with IEPs (3B)

Indicator 3B	2013*	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
ELA Target	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Result	18%	94.2%	93.4%	95.0%	94.18%	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	Yes	No	N/A
Math Target	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%	95%
Result	13%	93.8%	94.6%	94.7%	93.8%	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

\*Pilot year for California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress, only California Alternate Performance Assessment data was included.

**C. In FFY 2017 for Target C (Proficiency), the results are as follows:**

Percent Proficient for Students with Disabilities (3C)

Type of LEA	ELA Target	ELA Result	Target Met	Math Target	Math Result	Target Met
Elementary School Districts	14.0%	16.1%	Yes	12.6%	12.9%	Yes
High School Districts	14.9%	15.9%	Yes	12.6%	7.2%	No
Unified School Districts and County Offices of Education	14.9%	14.8%	No	12.6%	11.3%	No

## Indicator 4A: Suspension and Expulsion Overall

### Description

Indicator 4A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][A] and 1412[a][22]). An LEA is considered to have a significant discrepancy if the districtwide rate for suspension and expulsion exceeds the statewide rate for suspension and expulsion. The statewide rate is the number of students with IEPs who were disciplined greater than 10 days divided by the number of students with IEPs in the state. LEAs identified to have a significant discrepancy are required to review policies, procedures, and practices related to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards. The data reported here are from FFY 2016–17.

### Target for 2017–18

No more than 10 percent of LEAs will have rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year. These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFYs 2013–18.

### Measurement

The data are reported using the CALPADS data from the FFY 2016 (lag year). The percent is calculated by the number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of students with IEPs for greater than 10 days in a school year divided by the number of LEAs in the state, multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2017–18

In FFY 2017, there were 40 LEAs (3.67 percent) that had a rate of suspension and expulsion for more than 10 days of students with disabilities greater than the statewide rate.

### Target Met: Yes

#### Suspension and Expulsion Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 4A	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%	≤10%
Result	1.2%	2.13%	2.31%	3.21%	3.67%	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A

## Indicator 4B: Suspension and Expulsion Rate by Race or Ethnicity

### Description

Indicator 4B is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs that have: (1) significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities; and (2) policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][A] and 1412[a][22]).

### Target for 2017–18

Zero percent of LEAs will have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities by race.

### Measurement

The data are reported using the CALPADS data from FFY 2016 (lag year). This percent is calculated by the number of LEAs that have: (1) A significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of students with disabilities; and (2) policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards divided by the number of LEAs in the state, multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2017–18

In FFY 2017, 6.34 percent of LEAs had a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year for students with disabilities by race.

**Target Met: No**

### Suspension/Expulsion by Race or Ethnicity Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 4B	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Result	1.89 %	2.31 %	5.74 %	2.78 %	6.34 %	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	No	N/A	N/A

## Indicator 5: Education Environments

### Description

Indicator 5 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities, ages six to twenty-two, served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day; inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day, and served in public or private separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placement.

### Targets for 2017–18

These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFYs 2013–18.

- 5A. A target of 51.2 percent or more of students with disabilities will be in regular class 80 percent of the day or more;
- 5B. No more than 22.6 percent of students with disabilities will be removed from regular class more than 60 percent of the day; **and**
- 5C. No more than 4.0 percent of students with disabilities are served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound/hospital placements.

### Measurement

- 5A. The number of students with disabilities served inside the regular class 80 percent or more of the day divided by the total number of students age six to twenty-two with disabilities.
- 5B. The number of students with disabilities served inside the regular class less than 40 percent of the day divided by the total number of students age six to twenty-two with disabilities.
- 5C. The number of students with disabilities served in public or private separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements divided by the total number of students ages six to twenty-two with disabilities.

### Results for 2017–18

California did meet the targets for 5A (56.10 percent of students were in regular class 80 percent of the day or more); for 5B, (19.82 percent of students were in regular class less than 40 percent of the day); and for 5C, (3.40 percent of students were served in public or private separate schools and facilities).

**Target Met: 5A Yes 5B Yes 5C Yes**

### Education Environment Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

<b>Indicator 5</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
5A Target – LRE > 80%	49.2%	49.2%	49.2%	50.2%	51.2%	52.2%
Result	56.3%	53.3%	54.07%	54.9%	56.10 %	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
5B Target – LRE < 40%	24.6%	24.6%	24.6%	23.6%	22.6%	21.6%
Result	23.6%	22%	21.53%	20.6%	19.82 %	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
5C Target – LRE: Separate School	4.4%	4.4%	4.4%	4.2%	4%	3.8%
Result	3.9%	3.3%	3.63%	3.5%	3.40%	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A

## **Indicator 6: Preschool Least Restrictive Environments**

### **Description**

Indicator 6 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities ages three through five years, attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related service in the regular early childhood program; as well as children with disabilities attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][A]).

### **Target for 2017–18**

These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFYs 2013–18.

- A. A target of 34.9 percent or more of children with disabilities will be served in settings with typically developing peers.
- B. No more than 32.4 percent of children with disabilities will be served in a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.

### **Measurement**

- A. Percent = (number of children ages three through five with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total number of children ages three through five with IEPs), multiplied by 100.
- B. Percent = (number of children ages three through five with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility) divided by the (total number of children ages three through five with IEPs), multiplied by 100.

### **Results for 2017–18**

- A. For FFY 2017, 37.32 percent of children ages three through five attended a regular early childhood program and received the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program.
- B. For FFY 2017, 33.81 percent of children ages three through five attended a separate special education class, separate school, or residential facility.

**Target Met: 6A Yes 6B No**

**Preschool Environments Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

<b>Indicator 6</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
6A Target – Preschool Regular Setting	32.9%	32.9%	32.9%	33.9%	34.9%	35.9%
Result	32.9%	32.9%	44.13%	45.19 %	37.32 %	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
6B Target – Preschool Separate Class, School, or Facility	34.4%	34.4%	34.4%	33.4%	32.4%	31.4%
Result	34.4%	34.4%	31.45%	29.86 %	33.81 %	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	N/A

## **Indicator 7A: Preschool Assessment–Positive Social-Emotional Skills**

### **Description**

Indicator 7A is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in Positive Social-Emotional Skills, including social relationships.

### **Targets for 2017–18**

- Of those children with disabilities who entered the program with below age expectations, 83.2 percent will substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.
- Of those children with disabilities who were functioning within age expectations, 79.5 percent will function within age expectations by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.

### **Measurement**

Positive social-emotional skills, including social relationships:

- Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with IEPs assessed, multiplied by 100.

### **Results for 2017–18**

For FFY 2017, 76.7 percent of students substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program, and 77.6 percent of students were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned six years of age or exit the program.

**Target Met: No**

**Preschool Outcomes–Positive Social-Emotional Skills Targets and Results for  
FFY 2013–18**

<b>Indicator 7A</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016*</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Target	72.7% / 82.1%	72.7% / 82.1%	67.6%/ 72.5%	82.2%/ 78.5%	83.2%/ 79.5%	84.2%/ 80.5%
Result	59.4%/ 60.8%	60.9%/ 60.3%	67.6%/ 72.5%	82.2%/ 78.5%	76.7%/ 77.6%	N/A
Target Met	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	N/A

\*Targets were changed this year

## **Indicator 7B: Preschool Assessment–Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills**

### **Description**

Indicator 7B is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills, including early language/communication and early literacy.

### **Targets for 2017–18**

- Of those children with disabilities who entered the program with below age expectations, 80.7 percent will substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.
- Of children with disabilities who were functioning within age expectations, 78.57 percent will function within age expectations by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.

### **Measurement**

Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication and early literacy is measured by the:

- Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.

**Results for 2017–18**

In FFY 2017, 76.1 percent of students substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exited the program; and 76.7 percent of students were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned six years of age or exit the program.

**Target Met: No**

**Preschool Outcomes–Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

<b>Indicator 7B</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016*</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Target	70% / 82.5%	70% / 82.5%	68.6% / 71.2%	79.7%/ 77.57%	80.7%/ 78.57%	81.7%/ 79.57%
Result	60.9% / 60.3%	60.2% / 59.6%	68.6% / 71.2%	79.7%/ 77.6%	76.1%/ 76.7%	N/A
Target Met	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	N/A

\* Targets were changed this year due to new assessment tool

## **Indicator 7C: Preschool Assessment–Use of Appropriate Behaviors**

### **Description**

Indicator 7C is a performance indicator that measures the percent of children with disabilities who demonstrate improvement in Use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their needs (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][A]).

### **Targets for 2017–18**

- Of those children who entered the program with below age expectations, 74.7 percent will substantially increase their rate of growth by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.
- Of those children who were functioning within age expectations, 77.45 percent will function within age expectations by the time they turn six years of age or exit the program.

### **Measurement**

Use of Appropriate Behaviors to meet their needs:

- Number of preschool children who did not improve functioning divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.
- Number of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by the number of preschool children with disabilities assessed, multiplied by 100.

**Results for 2017–18**

In FFY 2017, 75.34 percent of students substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six years of age or exit the program; and 77.02 percent of students were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned six years of age or exit the program.

**Target Met: Yes/No**

**Preschool Outcomes–Use of Appropriate Behaviors Targets and Results  
for FFY 2013–18**

<b>Indicator 7C</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016*</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Target	75% / 79%	75% / 79%	68.7% / 70.4%	73.7%/ 76.45%	74.7%/ 77.45%	75.7%/ 78.45%
Result	65.9% / 65.7%	65.8% / 65.8%	68.7% / 70.4%	73.7%/ 76.5%	75.34%/ 77.02%	N/A
Target Met	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes/No	N/A

\* Targets were changed this year due to new assessment tool

## **Indicator 8: Percent of Parents Reporting the Schools Facilitated Parental Involvement**

### **Description**

Indicator 8 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of parents with a student receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][A]). These data are one question in a survey distributed, collected, and reported by the Special Education Local Plan Areas (SELPA's). The measure is the percentage of parents responding "yes" to the following question: "Did the school district facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for your child?"

### **Target for 2017–18**

Ninety-two percent of parents will report LEAs facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities. These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFYs 2013–18.

### **Measurement**

The number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for students with disabilities divided by the total number of respondent parents of students with disabilities.

### **Results for 2017–18**

The result for FFY 2017 was 99.56 percent of respondent parents with a student receiving special education services reported that LEAs facilitated parental involvement.

### **Target Met: Yes**

#### **Parent Involvement/Input–Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

<b>Indicator 8</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Target	90%	90%	90%	91%	92%	93%
Result	99.1%	99.2%	93.8%	99.5%	99.56 %	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Description

Indicator 9 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][C]). The calculation for Indicator 9 has been changed to match the new federal regulations in 34 *Code of Federal Regulation* (CFR) 300.647. Effective FFY 2016, the CDE uses the risk ratio (or the alternate risk ratio when appropriate) to make identification of disproportionate representation. LEAs selected are required to go through a review of policies, practices, and procedures.

### Target for 2017–18

Zero percent of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification.

### Measurement

The number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification divided by the number of LEAs in the state.

### Results for 2017–18

For FFY 2017, 0.88 percent of LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services as a result of inappropriate identification. The CDE requires these disproportionate LEAs to implement corrective actions.

**Target Met: No**

### Disproportionate Representation Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 9	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Result	.09%	.09%	0%	2.57%	0.88%	N/A
Target Met	No	No	Yes	No	N/A	N/A

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation by Disability Categories

### Description

Indicator 10 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][C]). The calculation for Indicator 10 (Ethnicity by Disability) has been changed to match the new federal regulations in 34 CFR 300.647. Effective FFY 2016, the CDE uses the risk ratio (or the alternate risk ratio when appropriate) to make identification of disproportionate representation. LEAs selected are required to go through a review of policies, practices, and procedures. LEAs identified below had noncompliance in those reviews.

### Target for 2017–18

Zero percent of LEAs will have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification.

### Measurement

The number of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, as identified by either the risk ratio or the alternate risk ratio, which is the result of inappropriate identification divided by the number of LEAs in the state.

### Results for 2017–18

For FFY 2017, 27.76 percent of LEAs had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories as a result of inappropriate identification. The CDE requires these significant disproportionate LEAs to implement corrective actions.

**Target Met: No**

### Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 10	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Result	.57%	.87%	.75%	17.14 %	27.76 %	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	No	N/A	N/A

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Description

Indicator 11 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the state establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][B]). These data were calculated using CASEMIS data fields related to parental consent date and initial evaluation date. Determination of eligibility was made using the data field which includes the type of plan a student has (IEP, Individualized Family Support Plan, Individual Service Plan), if the student is eligible, or no plan if the student is determined ineligible. If the parent of a student repeatedly failed or refused to bring the student for the evaluation, or a student enrolled in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations had begun, and prior to a determination by the students previous public agency as to whether the student is a student with a disability, then the student was eliminated from both the numerator and the denominator.

### Target for 2017–18

Eligibility determinations will be completed within 60 days for 100 percent of students with disabilities for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

### Measurement

The number of students whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or a state-established time line) divided by the number of students for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

### Results for 2017–18

For FFY 2017, 97.86 percent of eligibility determinations were completed within 60 days for students whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

**Target Met: No**

### Child Find Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 11	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Result	98.1%	96%	98.76%	98.5%	97.86 %	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Description

Indicator 12 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of children referred by the infant program (IDEA Part C) prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][B]). These data were collected through CASEMIS and data from the Department of Developmental Services.

### Target for 2017–18

One hundred percent of children referred by the IDEA Part C prior to age three and who are found eligible for the IDEA Part B will have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.

### Measurement

- a) Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B (LEA notified pursuant to the IDEA section 637[a][9][A] for Part B eligibility determination).
- b) Number of children referred determined to **not** be eligible and whose eligibilities were determined prior to their third birthday.
- c) Number of children found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday.
- d) Number of children for whom parental refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services.
- e) Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

Percent of children referred equals (c) divided by (a-b-d-e) times 100.

### Results for 2017–18

For FFY 2017, 95.16 percent of children referred by Part C of IDEA prior to age three and who were found eligible for Part B of IDEA had an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday. To increase this rate, the CDE has been partnering with the IDEA Part C agency, the California Department of Developmental Services, to increase timely referrals.

**Target Met: No**

### Early Childhood Transition Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

<b>Indicator 12</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Result	98.5%	93.5%	86%	94%	95.16 %	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

## **Indicator 13: Secondary Transition**

### **Description**

Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of students with disabilities ages sixteen and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment and transition services, including courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition service needs. There must also be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][B]).

### **Target for 2017–18**

One hundred percent of students ages sixteen and above will have an IEP that includes appropriate and measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment and transition services.

### **Measurement**

Number of students with IEPs ages sixteen and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment and transition services divided by the number of students with an IEP ages sixteen and above.

### **Results for 2017–18**

For FFY 2017, 99.77 percent of students with IEPs, ages sixteen and above, have all eight postsecondary goals included in their IEPs which include (1) education, training, employment, and independent living; (2) updated goals according to the student's changing strengths and preferences; (3) age appropriate transition assessment; (4) services that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her goals; (5) courses that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her goals; (6) annual goals related to the student's transition services needs; (7) evidence the student was invited to the IEP meeting; and (8) evidence a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP meeting with prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

**Target Met: No**

**Secondary Transition (Part C to Part B) Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18**

<b>Indicator 13</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Result	93.5%	99.4%	99.6%	99.8%	99.77 %	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

## **Indicator 14: Post-school Outcomes**

### **Description**

Indicator 14 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school but had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were either enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school; enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school; or enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][B]).

### **Target for 2017–18**

These targets represent changes approved by the SBE and the OSEP in FFY 2014 and will be in effect for FFYs 2013–18.

- A. A target of 53.3 percent or more of youth who had IEPs who are no longer in secondary school will be reported to have been enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.
- B. A target of 73.4 percent or more of youth who had IEPs who are no longer in secondary school will be reported to have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.
- C. A target of 82 percent or more of youth who had IEPs who are no longer in secondary school will be reported to have been enrolled in higher education or in some type of postsecondary school, or training program; or competitively employed in some other employment.

### **Measurement**

- A. The number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when they left school, and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school divided by the number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school.
- B. Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when they left school, and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school divided by the number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school.
- C. Number of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect when they left school, and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in

some other employment divided by the number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school.

### Results for 2017–18

- A. For FFY 2017, 53.97 percent of youth who had IEPs who were no longer in secondary school reported to have been enrolled in some type of postsecondary school within one year of leaving high school.
- B. For FFY 2017, 77.6 percent of youth who had IEPs who were no longer in secondary school reported to have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.
- C. For FFY 2017, 85.56 percent of youth who had IEPs who were no longer in secondary school reported to have been enrolled in higher education or in some type of postsecondary school, or training program; or competitively employed in some other employment.

**Target Met: A. Yes B. Yes C. Yes**

### Post-school Outcomes Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

<b>Indicator 14</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>
14A Target – Postsecondary	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	52.3%	53.3%	54.3%
Result	52.3%	50.4%	52.3%	48.9%	53.97%	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	N/A
14B Target – Employed/Postsecondary	72.4%	72.4%	72.4%	72.4%	73.4%	74.4%
Result	72.4%	72.4%	75.5%	72.6%	77.6%	N/A
Target Met	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
14C Target – Any Education/Employment	81%	81%	81%	81%	82%	83%
Result	81%	82.1%	83.2%	81.7%	85.56%	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Description

Indicator 15 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of due process hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][B]).

### Target for 2017–18

Fifty-nine percent of due process hearing requests will be resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

### Measurement

Percent equals the number of resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements divided by the number of resolution sessions multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2017–18

For FFY 2017, 24.1 percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

**Target Met: No**

### Resolution Sessions Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 15	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	55%	56%	57%	58%	59%	60%
Result	32.7%	30.2%	32.17%	31.24 %	24.1 %	N/A
Target Met	No	No	No	No	No	N/A

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Description

Indicator 16 is a performance indicator that measures the percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416[a][3][B]).

### Target for 2017–18

Fifty-nine percent of mediation conferences will result in mediation agreements.

### Measurement

Percent equals mediation agreements related to due process complaints plus mediation agreements not related to due process complaints divided by number of mediations held, multiplied by 100.

### Results for 2017–18

For FFY 2017, 57.8 percent of mediation conferences resulted in mediation agreements.

**Target Met: No**

### Mediation Targets and Results for FFY 2013–18

Indicator 16	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	55%	56%	57%	58%	59%	60%
Result	65.1%	62.6%	60.06%	53.60 %	57.8 %	N/A
Target Met	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	N/A

## **Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

### **Description**

The State Systemic Improvement Plan indicator describes how the state identified and analyzed key data, including data from the SPP/APR indicators, section 618 of the IDEA data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) Select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for students with disabilities, and (2) Identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the state should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the state identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the state will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data. This indicator will be reported to the SBE in March 2019 for approval and will be submitted to OSEP in April 2019.